

United States Patent and Trademark Office

ENTIFED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMME. Colled Same: Patest and Traderagh. Office sideon COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS FD 18st 145-40s.mins, Vigina 2213-1450

APPLICATION NO	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/051,352	01/18/2002	Timothy W. Rawlings	9059 00	9275
7540 6607/2004			EXAMINER	
MILLEN, WHITE, ZELANO & BRANIGN, P.C.			NORDMEYER, PATRICIA L	
ARLINGTON COURTHOUSE PLAZA I 2200 CLARENDON BLVD., SUITE 1400 ARLINGTON, VA 22201			ART UNIT	FAPER NUMBER
			1772	

DATE MAILED: 05/07/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)
		10/051,352	RAWLINGS, TIMOTHY W.
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
		Patnoia L. Nordmeyer	1772
Period fe	The MAILING DATE of this communication ap or Reply	pears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address
THE - Extended - If the - If NO - Faile - Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL MALLING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION, notice of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. 50; (4) MONTH'S form the making date of this communication, particle for reply specified above is inso than their (50) days, a specified above. He macrimen statisticy period parent for reply is apertified above. He macrimen statisticy period parent for reply is apertified above. He macrimen statisticy period prices for reply as apertified above. He macrimen statistics period reply according by the Office lister than three macrims state the mallie ad plant times disjustant. See 25 CFR 1.76(6).	136(a). In no avent, however, may a r by within the statutory minimum of thin will apply and will expire SIX (6) MOI, e, curso the application to become AE	eply be timely filed by (30) days will be considered timely. This from the making date of this communication (ANDONED) (35 U.S.C. § 133)
Status			
1)[3]	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 A	April 2004.	
2a)	This action is FINAL. 2b) ☑ Thi	s action is non-final.	
3)□	Since this application is in condition for allowa	ince except for formal matt	ers, prosecution as to the merits is
	closed in accordance with the practice under	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D	. 11, 453 O.G. 213.
Disposit	ion of Claims		
4)🖂	Claim(s) 1-19 and 22-29 is/are pending in the	application.	
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra	wn from consideration.	
	Claim(s) is/are allowed.		
	Claim(s) 1-19 and 22-29 is/are rejected.		
	Claim(s) is/are objected to.		
8)	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	or election requirement.	
Applicat	ion Papers		
9)[The specification is objected to by the Examin	er.	
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc		
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the		
_	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct		
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	xaminer. Note the attacher	d Office Action or form PTO-152.
Priority	under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	n priority under 35 U.S.C. §	119(a)-(d) or (f).
a)	All b) Some * c) None of:		
	1. Certified copies of the priority documen		
	 Certified copies of the priority document 		
	 Copies of the certified copies of the price 		received in this National Stage
	application from the International Burea	u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	
	See the attached detailed Office action for a list		

Paper No(s)/Mail Data

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)

Attachment(s)

Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Withdrawn Rejection

- The 35 U.S.C. 112 2nd paragraph rejection of claims 1 19, 22 and 23 is withdrawn due to the Applicant's amendments in the paper dated April 28, 2004.
- The 35 U.S.C. 103 rejection of claims 4, 7, 8 and 11 13 over Tataryan et al. (USPN 6,136,130) in view of Popat et al. (USPN 5,662,976) is withdrawn due to the Applicant's amendments in the paper dated April 28, 2004 and the lack of a rejection of claim 11 by the Examiner.

Repeated Rejection

3. The 35 U.S. C. 103 rejection of claims 1 – 3, 5, 6, 9, 10 and 17 – 19 over Tataryan et al. (USPN 6,136,130) is repeated for the reasons of record stated in the paper dated January 28, 2004. Please the last paragraph of the rejection to the addition to the rejection covering the amendment to claim 1.

Tataryan et al. discloses a printable substrate that is folded during storage and is unfolded before being printed on (Column 1, lines 4 – 6). The substrate is a single sheet of card stock or a label larminate with integrated labels (Column 3, lines 13 – 14) that contains one fold line across the width of the sheet, defining where the sheet is folded (Figure 1, #24). A line of perforations extends across the width and entire thickness (Figure 2, #26) of the sheet, allowing the sheet to be folded (Column 4, lines 57 – 62). The perforations are able to be formed in a variety of combinations and configurations as long as the perforations provide the necessary strength and flexibility (Column 4, lines 47 – 57), and they are inherently formed in a discontinuous line of perforations with intermittent non-perforated areas (Figure 1, #24). The sheet is folded and unfolded at least once before printing without separation occurring (Figure 4). In order to separate the sheet at the fold line, a tensile strength of at least 4.5 to 5 or more kilograms must be applied (Column 4, lines 38 – 41). The non-perforated sections of the fold line comprise 50% of the fold line (Column 5, lines 5 – 7).

The prior art element, the fold line formed of constant perforations across the width of the sheet (Figure 3, #26) is a structural equivalent of the corresponding element disclosed in the specification, the fold line formed of microperforated sections and non-perforated sections. That is, the prior art element performs the function, the ability of fold line to allow the sheet to be fold and unfolded along its length before printing or after printing (Column 1, lines 42 – 49), specified in the claim in substantially the same manner as the function is performed by the corresponding element, the fold line with microperforated and non-perforated sections, described in the specification. MPEP 2183

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the applicant's invention was made to have modified the length of the fold line to be folded and unfolded as described above. Application/Control Number: 10/051,352 Art Unit: 1772

One of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized the claimed printable substrate with both non-perforated and perforated sections in an alternating pattern having the length of non-perforated section being greater than one tie of the microperforation is performing an equivalent function to the substrate of Tataryan et al. is perforated while being perforated with a continuous pattern has the same strength of the claimed invention while keeping the perforations intact. Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would readily determine that the printable substrate of Tataryan et al. performs an equivalent function to the claimed printable substrate depending on the desired end results in the absence of unexpected results.

New Rejections

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all
obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action.

(a) A paster rawy not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pretains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

 Claims 4, 7, 8, 11 – 16 and 22 – 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tataryan et al. (USPN 6,136,130) in view of Popat et al. (USPN 5,662,976) and further in view of Black (USPN 6.540,131).

Tataryan et al. discloses the claimed printable substrate with a line of perforations that

extends across the width and entire thickness (Figure 3, #26) of the sheet, allowing the sheet to be folded (Column 4, lines 57 – 62). The perforations are able to be formed in a variety of combinations and configurations as long as the perforations provide the necessary strength and flexibility (Column 4, lines 47 – 57), therefore it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to form the perforations in a discontinuous line of perforations with intermittent non-perforated areas where the length of the non-perforated section is 20% of the width with areas of microperforations of equal length. However, Tstaryan et al. fails to disclose the printable substrate being a form with removable labels integrated therein having preprinted indicia on said print medium, the substrate having two or more fold lines, the perforations having a maximum dimension in the range of 0.2 to 0.4 mm and the ties between these perforations are less than 0.5 mm in length and wherein the non-perforated sections have a length from 1 to 5 mm.

Popat et al. teaches to use fold lines formed by microperforations through the thickness of the card stock (Figure 3, #48 and 50 and Column 3, lines 40 – 46) to form two or more sections (Column 2, lines 51 – 55), where the microperforations have cuts in lengths between 0.24 mm to 0.27mm and ties between 0.11mm and 0.14 mm (Column 8, lines 44 – 49) in a printable laminated card substrate with preprinted indicia on the substrate (Column 7, lines 35 – 37) for the purpose of printing a laminated card with a laser jet printer from a sheet of material having a constant thickness that will not cause inms in the orinter naner path.

Black teaches the use of breaks, or non-perforated sections, having a length of 5 to 10 mm (Column 6, lines 18 – 20 and Figure 3, #22) on a fold line in a stationary formed with

printable material (Column 6, lines 63 – 64) for the purpose of preventing the propagation of a tear along a crease line in a printable substrate (Column 6, lines 25 – 30).

Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the changing of the lengths of perforations and non-perforated areas is well known in the art to be used in combination with printable substrates to prevent jams in the printer paper path as taught by Popat et al. and to prevent the propagation of a tear along a crease line in a printable substrate as taught by Black.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the applicant's invention was made to have provided the microperforations with specific cut and lengths in a card stock material with preprinted indicia and non-perforated sections having a length of 5 to 10 mm in Tataryan et al. in order to print a laminated card with a laser jet printer from a sheet of material having a constant thickness that will not cause jams in the printer paper path and to prevent the propagation of a tear along a crease line in a printable substrate as taught by Popat et al. and Black.

Response to Arguments

 Applicant's arguments filed April 28, 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to Applicant's argument that the references fail to disclose the perforations as

Microperforations with lengths less than 0.5 mm, Popat et al. teach perforations have cuts in lengths between 0.24 mm to 0.27mm and ties between 0.11mm and 0.14 mm (Column 8, lines 44 – 49), which fall within the range specified in the specification of the lengths of microperforations

In response to Applicant's argument that the references fail to disclose non-perforated sections having lengths between 1 – 5 mm, please see the above new 35 U.S.C. rejection with the introduction of the new prior art. Black, USPN 6,540,f31.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Patricia L. Nordmeyer whose telephone number is (571) 272-1496. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thurs, from 7:00-4:30 & alternate Pridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Harold Y. Pyon can be reached on (571) 272-1498. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, occutant the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Patricia L. Nordmeyer Examiner Art Unit 1772

HAROLD PYON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

6/3/04